Dear Orestes, 6/29/75

The delay in responding to your letter of the 10th, which reached me promptly, is because I was off on a trip when it came and after I returned home I wanted my lawyer friend Jim to translate it for me so I could be certain of all meanings. He has just left. I barely have time to start before supper, but I'll get it answered now. I'm sorry about the delay. But this kind of thing happens and I feel I should be quite careful who I trust.

He and I have both been quite busy with a suit I have going against the FBI. He came today for me to go over the draft of an affidavit I gave him that he had re-worked into better form, as a lawyer.

(It may amuse you to know that their only defense against the charge I made against them on the record, that they committed perjury, was to claim that I could keep on making these kinds of charges indefinitely because I know more about the subject than anyone at the FBI. They did not even claim that they had not sworn falsely!)

Now it happens that someone from the Church commitee is supposed to be here this week. It also happens that you cannot get a dependable reading on what they will and will not do from what is on TV and in the papers. It is not as one would expect but it also is not bad, as I'll have to explain. But please understand that in about two weeks, after this second meeting with a member of the staff, I'll have a second meeting with a Senator on that committee, a fine man I've known for maybe 20 years.

Please keep all of this to yourself.

Despite all you may have heard and read, this committee is not going to re-investigate the JFK assassination. The most that can be expected is that it will recommend that there be a separate such investigation (for which there seems to be some centiment) It has been besieged with all the nuts in the country with more to pour in that I know of. This has had the effect of wasting their time and discouraging them. However, it is listening to some and it will seriously consider evidence about the malfunctioning of the federal agencies. So, it may be willing to hear what you can tell it about the FBI and the CIA. Not, I think, in the sense of who killed JFK but how the agencies investigated it.

Before they will say whether or not they will hear someone they will want to know what he can say. This presents somewhat of a problem that I think can be overcome by a tape that summarizes what you would say. I could and would see to it that they receive this and I am confident listen to it and probably ask me questions about it.

However, they will want proof, not just opinions. Proof that you may have or to which you can refer them. Like other witnesses some of whom I know about and/or have interviewed.

They are taking evidence in several ways, mostly by members of the staff because the Senators themselves have too much to do. They generally hear the big officials.

Some are, by purpose, not unfriendly to those whose work was not good. This is called "balancing" but it actually is to keep some of the politicians from making too much complaint. Some of them, both Members of the committee and some of the staff, will not be friendly to any criticism of the FBI, CIA or Warren Commission. Especially not after all the lies the nuts told the Rockefeller Commission, which used them for new false propaganda. This has made a very serious problem.

When this staff member comes here this week I'll show him your letter and Jim's translation of it and tell him what I know about you, how you were treated and what I recall of what you can say. I'll let you know how he reacts because there is also competition for the time. With all these nuts clamoring to be heard and having done it for so long, they are ahead. They tell one story in advance and then when they appear their stories come apart. But it takes and wastes time.

If you write Church your letter will get lost in the mass of them or will be answered by some clerk when he gets around to it. I will make the direct offer for you immediately. But I do think it would be best for there to be a tape they can listen to. The accent will make no difference. I can explain it. I make you out well. They are not used to accents. Washington is not like New Orleans that way.

Because I want your approach to them to be as effective as possible I take the liberty of making a few suggestions.

First, you should make notes on what you want to say before you start to make any tape at all. This should be broken into several different parts, one to follow the other.

Begin by introducing yourself with a brief account of your personal history. Then go into when and how you became an informant and for whom, which agency, and what purpose or purposes as they were explained to you. Give the dates as best you remember them and all the agents' names.

If all of this was on Cuban activity, I'd break it down into what was supposed to be anti-Castro and what happened at the Frente meetings, like who was at them of the agents and others of interest or possible interest.

Here and in each case I'd make a list of the facts I'd want to state and after each how each can be proven. Then when you recite each fact you can follow it without having to stop to think. It will be in your mind and on paper.

You realize I can be more specific than this about names but I think it best that we be completely honorable and nobody ever be able to claim that I put names or words in your mouth and mind. (Yes, I still have the tapes of the interviews.)

Organizing it and presenting it in an organized manner will make a better impression and a better presentation. You owe it to yourself and to the committee to take this time and do it all right. However, I do suggest that you do it on your own because of some of the experiences you have had with lawyers and some of the things that have gone on in New Orleans.

As you can see, I am also suggesting that you take this in order of time, what came first coming first as you tell it. In this way you will come to the Warren Commission and how you were treated, questioned, etc.

I would take that part in separate parts, beginning with what you think led them to you and if you know, how you know. Then what they were interested in. Then what they were not interested in, if anything, in each case again with all names.

After you have gone through all of that I would have another part on what you think you may have known in which you could get no interest and if this is the case, how you tried to develop interest or what persuaded you not to.

In this part I'd keep strictly to what could have a direct connection with the JFK investigation and if you want make a separate list of other things that may or may not, like some of the people about whom you spoke to me.

Where you cannot prove something but believe it to be true, I'd say straight out this I cannot prove but these are the reasons I believe it.

If you would like and if you do it this way I'll promise you I'll listen to the tape or tapes and write you as soon as I do. I'll also hold them or deliver them, whatever you prefer. My recommendation is that I give them to this man after double-checking with you. You are my friend and I will take this time. I'll probably do it on tape because that will be faster. I can then do it as I listen. This may make for a little confusion if there is repetition or explanations later. We'll see. Maybe I'll make a tape and then listen to and type it up.

There are special advantages to this procedure. First of all I can help you without doing anything questionable. Then after we are sure you have everything important I can give them the tapes and at the very least, if they do not call you in person as a witness they will have that record. I think there is still another possibility, that after listening to the tapes they may want to question you privately, not at a full hearing. If you want I can then be with you, I think.

The Committee and the individual Members decide what they can and will go into. They receive much more information in various forms than they can consider officially. This information remains in their files and is not wasted.

If you take the approach I recommend you will not be dealing with total strangers because I can tell all I know about you. You would then also be heard by one who is interested only in what you can say, not in being an adversary or someone else's defender. Someone whose only interest is in fact and truth, whatever it may be. My recommendation is that at least to begin with it be as informal as possible. My best wishes,